

REMARKS

In response to the final office action of June 18, 2007, Applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-26 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 10, and 18 are independent. Claims 1-3, 10, 18, 23, and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Dada for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during a personal interview on September 5, 2007. During the interview, Examiner Dada and Applicants' representative discussed amended independent claim 1 shown above in the listing of claims. Examiner Dada agreed that the proposed amendment to independent claim 1 overcomes the pending rejection based on Griffin (2002/0178119) and Hashimoto (EP 0 992 873 A2). See Interview Summary of September 5, 2007. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

Claims 1-26 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hashimoto and Griffin. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because neither Hashimoto, Griffin, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or properly suggests all of the features of amended independent claims 1, 10, and 18. As noted in the Interview Summary of September 5, 2007, Examiner Dada has agreed that amended independent claim 1 overcomes the rejection based on Hashimoto and Griffin.

With respect to amended independent claim 1, Applicants submit that the cited prior art fails to describe or suggest at least programmatically comparing the first attribute value with the second attribute value, based on comparison results, programmatically determining whether the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, and, conditioned on determining that the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, generating access control information that permits at least one user associated with the at least one user data entry in the user information to access the at least one object data entry in the data object information.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 and 23-26.

Independent claim 18, although different in scope from independent claim 1, recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and does so in the context of a

computer-readable medium. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 18 and its dependent claims 19-22.

As amended, independent claim 10 recites an executable software module configured to, inter alia, programmatically compare the first attribute value, the second attribute value, and an attribute value identified by the shared characteristic, based on comparison results, programmatically determine whether the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, and generate access control information for use in determining whether a user that is associated with the at least one user data entry in the user information is permitted to access the at least one object data entry in the data object information.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, Examiner Dada agreed that the proposed amendment to independent claim 1 overcomes the pending rejection based on Hashimoto and Griffin. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited prior art fails to describe or suggest programmatically comparing the first attribute value with the second attribute value, based on comparison results, programmatically determining whether the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, and, conditioned on determining that the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, generating access control information that permits at least one user associated with the at least one user data entry in the user information to access the at least one object data entry in the data object information, as recited by amended claim 1. Thus, the cited prior art necessarily also fails to describe or suggest an executable software module configured to programmatically compare the first attribute value, the second attribute value, and an attribute value identified by the shared characteristic, based on comparison results, programmatically determine whether the first attribute value corresponds to the second attribute value, and generate access control information for use in determining whether a user that is associated with the at least one user data entry in the user information is permitted to access the at least one object data entry in the data object information, as recited in amended independent claim 10.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-17.

Applicant : Matthias Vogel et al.
Serial No. : 10/642,500
Filed : August 18, 2003
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-134001 / 2003P00532

US


It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$790.00 in payment of the RCE fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/13/2007



Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331